

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents some theories related to this study. The discussion covers discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and some models of critical discourse analysis.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

The term 'discourse' has taken various, sometimes very wide meanings. Originally, the word 'discourse' comes from Latin 'discursus' which denoted 'conversation, speech' (Gee: 1999; p. 10). Discourse has large domain which attaches to other disciplines, such as political, philosophical, and sociological domains. Discourse itself has a number of meanings that are more complicated in termination of the existence of discourse in a number of areas of study. Because people use it not only for communication but also to influence other people to support their interest through ideological purpose, discourse constrains the emergence of specific studies to typically concern with (Van Dijk: 2004). The emergence of discourse in social practice, afterwards, has encouraged the emergence of interdisciplinary studies that is concerned with the analysis of the relationship between discourse and social practice.

In linguistics, the interdisciplinary study, which is concerned with this phenomenon, is recognized as Discourse Analysis. As a new interdisciplinary study, discourse analysis began to develop in the late 1960s and 1970s in most of the humanities and social sciences, more or

less at the same time, and in relation to, other new branches of macro linguistics, such as psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and pragmatics. Whereas earlier studies of discourse, for instance in text linguistics, often focused on the abstract structures of (written) texts, many contemporary approaches, especially those that are influenced by the social sciences, favor a more dynamic study of (spoken, oral) talk in interaction.

Discourse analysis has three paradigms that underlie the analysis of phenomena in the real world. First, Positivist Discourse Analysis claims that discourse consists of semantic and syntactic that establishes and builds up the meaning regardless of the subjectivity of whom produces language. Positivist discourse analysts then merely investigated the word and sentence without considering the subject which produces language. Second, interpretive Discourse Analysis is the meaning of language that cannot only be seen from the forms, but it is also considered with the subject who produces language, the meaning, therefore, in accordance with interpretive discourse analysts is formed by the world of language and the producers of language. The process of the production and the reproduction of language, afterwards, are very important. This consideration of the process becomes the main factor that Critical Discourse Analysis has more concern. Critical Discourse Analysts want to understand the role of structures, strategies or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction and communicative events in establishing and maintaining power relations between different groups in society (Van Dijk: 1993).

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

One of the approaches to analyze in certain texts (oral and written) is through a critical concept. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a new paradigm of discourse analysis in which texts are to be described, explained, and interpreted or investigated deeply by positioning the neutral analyst (Fairclough: 1989). In general, CDA presupposes not only making the relationship of the interrogation product with the macro-contextual behind the text. Moreover, discourse analysis becomes 'critical' in the explanation of the ways in which unequal power relations are produced and naturalized in discourse. A critical discourse analysis explores texts not as truths, but as discourses that act in the world in ways that both define and distribute power. Such approaches are concerned not just to what the text says, but also with what texts do.

Fairclough & Wodak (1997) argued that CDA sees discourse and language as 'social practice' and considers the 'context language use' to be crucial. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situations and social structures, which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but also shaped by them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned-it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power.

It is the study of relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality, and position of the discourse analyst in such social relationships. Since this is a complex, multidisciplinary and is a yet underdeveloped domain of study, in which one may call socio-political discourse analysis.

Dominance in CDA is defined as the exercise of social power by elites, institutions or groups, that results in social inequality, including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial, and gender inequality. This reproduction process may involve such different modes of discourse, power relations as the more or less direct or overt support, enactment, representation, legitimating, denial, mitigation or concealment of dominance, among others. More specifically, critical discourse analysts want to know communicative events play a role in these modes of reproduction.

Similarly, Critical Discourse Analysis pays more attention to top down relations of dominance than to bottom-up relations of resistance, compliance and acceptance. This does not mean that we see power and dominance merely as unilaterally imposed on others. On the contrary, in many situations, and sometimes in other ways paradoxically, power and even power abuse may seem jointly produced, e.g. when dominated groups are persuaded, by whatever means, that dominance is natural or otherwise legitimate.

Van Dijk, in describing Critical Discourse Analysis states:

“Thus, although an analysis of strategies of resistance and challenges is crucial for our understanding of actual power and

dominance relations in society, and although such an analysis needs to include in a broader theory of power, counter-power and discourse, our critical approach prefers to focus on the elites and their discursive strategies for the maintenance of inequality.”

2.3 Teun Van Dijk’s Model of CDA

Van Dijk’s model of the CDA is a multidisciplinary framework which covers discourse, cognition, and society. Ideology and discourse are not the concepts that can be sufficiently studied in one discipline. Those require analysis in all disciplines of the humanities and the social sciences, namely the study of Discourse, Cognition and Society.

2.3.1 Discourse

According to Van Dijk (1998), a text consists of multiple structures or levels which mutually supportive. He divided them into three levels. First, the macrostructure. This is a global or common meaning of a text. Second, the superstructure. This is a structure of discourse associated with a framework of a text. Third, the microstructure is the meaning of discourse that can be observed from a small section of a text which are words, sentences, propositions, clause, paraphrasing, and images.

Table 2.1 The description of text structure, Van Dijk (1998)

Structures	Investigation	Units of Analysis
Macrostructure	(What is produced or said?) Elements: Topics and Themes	Text
Superstructure	Schematic (How is opinion arranged in sequence?) Elements: schema	Text

Microstructure	Semantics (What does opinion which is delivered mean?) Elements: surface or background, detail, illustration, intention, assumption, and reasoning	Paragraph
	Syntactic (How is opinion produced?) Elements: coherence, nominalization, abstract, sentence, and pronoun	Sentence, proposition
	Lexicon (What are words choice used?)	Word
	Rhetoric (In what way opinion is delivered?) Elements: style, interaction, expression, metaphor, and visual image	Sentence, proposition

Table 2.1 is explained in the following sub headings:

2.3.1.1 Macrostructures

Macrostructure covers topics or theme. It functions to explain what is most relevant. Macrostructure focused on the global meaning that more emphasize on the meaning of discourse theme or topic. Macrostructures are higher-level of semantic or conceptual structures that organize the 'local' microstructures of discourse, interaction, and their cognitive processing. (Van Dijk, 1980)

2.3.1.2 Superstructure

Superstructure is how opinion arranged in sequence. The elements of superstructure is a schema. Superstructure have been divined as conventionalized schemata, which provide the global 'form' for the macrostructural 'content' of a text. (Van Dijk, 1980)

2.3.1.3 Microstructures

Microstructure points on the local meaning of the discourse, by observing the semantic, syntactic, stylistic and rhetorical aspects. The use of words, proposition, and certain rhetoric in the media is understood by Van Dijk as the part of the writer's strategy. The use of certain words, sentences, and stylistic is not only viewed as the way of communication, but also as a method of communication politic to influence common premise, create the backing, strengthen legitimate, and evacuate the adversary or the opponent. In this structural level analysis of discourse, microstructure has four units of analysis, namely semantics, which analyzes the meaning of the text such as through the background, detail, and presupposition; syntactic which analyzes the sentence structure such as the sentence form and pronoun; stylistic is the unit of analysis which analyzes the word choice or lexicon; and rhetoric that explores the stressing used by the speaker in each the speaker way such as the metaphor and image.

Microstructure helps the readers understand similar word or sentence that includes semantic or syntactic aspect. Therefore the metaphor and expressions in the microstructure help the readers understand what the writer means. All of the aspect of microstructure is presented as the theory for analyzing the data source.

In microstructure analysis, syntactical analysis, local coherence, lexical choice and rhetoric analysis are carried out. In the syntactic analysis, the structure of the sentence use is inspected. Lexical choice is highly significant in terms of ideological construction. The fact that the same person can be defined as terrorist or freedom fighter is a common example given about this subject. In the news rhetoric, to make the news persuasive and convincing, the quotes from the witnesses are included as well. At this point, photographs are also the examples of being persuasive and convincing (van Dijk 1988a; 1988b; 1991).

Microstructure is an effective way to observe the next rhetorical and persuasive process when someone conveys the order. Certain words perhaps are chosen to clarify the choice and posture, form political consciousness, etc. The, microstructure is divided into four aspects, that are, semantic aspects, syntactical aspects, stylistic aspects, and rhetoric aspects. Yet, this study uses semantic aspect to investigate Gus Dur's purpose or intention. Semantic aspect deals with four components of analysis, that are: background, detail, intention and presupposition.

1) Semantic Aspects

Semantic elements include setting, detail, purpose, and presuppositions. The focus of this study is the 'purpose'. The purpose of Gus Dur's action is needed in this research because it support the 'discourse which covers in Van Dijk steps of analysis.

Setting is the part of the news that can influence semantic (meaning) that will be shown. The chosen setting then lead the view of public. Setting is usually shown at the beginning, before the journalists' opinion, which actually emerges to influence and give the impression that journalists' opinion is reasonable.

Detail relates to the information control which is delivered by the writer or journalists, whether the writer will deliver the information excessively which can give any benefit or good image to them, or they will show less information if it does not give any benefit or good image to them. Element means something which shows whether the information is explicitly delivered or not, or whether it is clear or not.

2) Syntactical Aspect

Syntactical aspect concerns with the construction of the forms and the structure of the sentences to build the expressing concept and the logical idea.

3) Stylistic Aspect

Stylistic aspect is the writer or speaker's style in expressing their message.

4) Rhetorical Aspect

Rhetoric is the interaction style of the writer or speaker in delivering their writing or speech, i.e. how they put their position in front of the public, whether it is formal or informal.

2.3.2 Cognition

Because critical discourse analysis is interested in power, domination, and social inequality, it tends to focus on groups, organizations and institutions. It means that 'cognition', as the second step, is used to give information which covers; knowledge, attitudes, and ideologies. 'Knowledge' makes sense to distinguish between different kinds of knowledge, namely personal knowledge, group knowledge and cultural knowledge. 'Attitudes' are socially shared opinions, such as the opinions people share about Gus Dur's presidency at that time. 'Ideologies' as the basic social representations of social group. They probably have a schematic structure that represents the self-image of each group, featuring membership devices, aims, activities, norms and resources of each group (as cited in Wodak, 2002:114-115).

Cognition covers the mental aspects of ideologies such as their nature as ideas or beliefs, their relations with opinions and knowledge, and their status as socially shared representations. According to Van Dijk, Cognition involves both personal as well as social cognition, beliefs, and goals as well as evaluations and emotions, and any other mental or memory structure, representations or processes involved in discourse and interaction. (as cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2001).

2.3.3 Society

Society as the third dimension of theoretical framework of Van Dijk deals with the relation between discourse and society. Critical Discourse Analysis may be interested in macro notions, such as power and domination, but their actual study takes place at the micro level of discourse and social practices. Likely, the 'cognition' dimension, 'Society' also has concepts, such as social situations, action, actors, and societal structure. 'Social situations', the structure of social situations is especially relevant to the context of the discourse. While the discourse is often defined as a communicative event, and occurring in a social situation, featuring a setting, participants in different roles, actions, and so on.

'Action', critical discourse analysis is not only interested in speech acts, but also in many other actions, interactions, and social practices that are accomplished by discourse, such as in this research is the action of society towards Gus dur regime. 'Actors', they are constituent categories of social situations and as parts of communicative situations, they have various communicative roles. They may be locally defined as individuals or globally in terms of groups, organizations or institutions. 'Societal structure', the local situations of interaction set the global societal structures. Participants speak and listen as women, mothers, lawyers, party members, or company executives. Likely, the interviewee will be

included to support the idea of 'Cognition' and 'Society', which covers the different social status.

Society examines the social, political, cultural and historical aspects of ideologies, the nature, and especially the role in the reproduction of, or resistance against, dominance. According to Van Dijk, 'society' is meant to include both the local, microstructure of situated face-to-face interactions, as well as the more global, societal and political structures variously defined in terms of groups, groups-relations (such as in dominance and inequality), movements, institutions, organizations, social processes, political systems and more abstract properties of societies and cultures. (as cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2001).

2.4 Speech Act Theory Proposed by Searle (1979)

Speech act theory used to support the 'Action', which included in the research question. This study uses speech act theory proposed by Searle (1979). An action that performs through language is called as speech acts. According to Searle (1979: 12-17), illocutionary act is used to accomplish some communicative purposes, such as asking, ordering, suggesting, requesting, informing, advising, greeting. He said that there are five categories of utterance found in illocutionary act. They are assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

1) Assertive

The acts in which the words state what speakers believe such as describing, reporting, claiming, hypothesizing, insisting and predicting. It also refers to speech act that describes states or events in the world such as a statement of fact, a report and a conclusion. For example in Gus Dur's utterance, 'she is close behind me'. His utterance is classified into assertive or representative because she claimed that Megawati was close behind him or Megawati was on his side.

2) Directives

This act makes the hearer doing something through words such as commanding, requesting, inviting, forbidding, and suggesting. Leech (1996:105-107) defined directive as an intention to produce some effects through action by the hearer. Yule (1996: 54) stated that speakers use to get someone else to something. They express what the speaker wants. For Example, in Gus Dur's utterance: "My message is don't be misled by what seems to be the winning side". The words have contain a command which orders the hearer for not misleading by what seems to be the winning side.

3) Commissives

Commit the speaker to some future course of action. The class involves: promising, offering, refusing, guarantee, pledging,

swearing, vowing, undertaking, warrant, etc. Leech (1996: 105-107) stated that commissive commits the speaker to some future action. It expresses what the speaker intends. Yule (1996: 54) stated that in using commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words (via the speaker). For example, "I will never step down. I will be in the office. You see I'm a Moslem, but if I'm not a Moslem then I can bet with you. I will be here until the end of my term." In the example, the words have meaning and contain a promise that the speaker will never give up until the end of his term.

4) Expressives

Express a psychological or mental state of the speaker. The class involves: thanking, congratulating, apologizing, appreciating, deploring, detesting, regretting, thanking, welcoming, etc.

5) Declarations

Changing the world through utterances can be expressed from this type. Yule (1996: 53) stated that declaratives are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via utterance. Declaring two singles to be a married couple, changing a nameless baby into one with name are the examples. For example, "I now pronounce you husband and wife". The meaning is declaring which a person who utters it is the priest.

Those illocutionary acts by Searle (1979) are used to answer the first research question, which included in 'Discourse' (dimension of Van Dijk theory).

2.5 Humanism Gus Dur

Humanism is also derived from the word humanity, which is given a suffix of *-ism* into humanism that shows the term flow or understanding. In a contemporary Indonesian dictionary, humanism is a notion that aims to foster a sense of humanity and aspire to create a better social life.

Humanism can be interpreted as a philosophical school of thought that will uphold human values and dignity. It makes the people as a measure of all the judgments, events, and symptoms on this earth as well. The term humanism is related to a term rooted in the same word, humanities, humanities, (Latin: humanior), which are the sciences aimed at making human beings more human, in the sense of making people more cultured. Humanism is also derived from a humanitarian study that implies the liberal artistry or humanitarian studies of Cicero. The essence of liberal arts is to liberate learners from ignorance and pettiness through intellectual development that includes grammar, rhetoric (speech), poetry, history, and moral philosophy. In the study of humanitatis, these sciences are deemed most capable of developing the human potential to think and act freely and independently.

In line with Siswanto Masruri, Zainal Abidin also understood humanism with a closer meaning to the liberal arts that encourage freedom of expression that would make human beings equal to one another, he said:

"The term "humanism" is derived from the word "humanity", which is the human education and in Greek called Paideia: education is supported by humans who want to place the liberal arts as its main material and means. They are convinced of the liberal arts, human beings will be inspired to become human beings, to be free human beings who are not constrained by forces from outside themselves. Humanism at the time with a theme of freedom against the dogma of the church, but the freedom it fought for was not an absolute freedom or as an anti-thesis of medieval determinism. For the freedom which they strive for is the freedom of human character and they do not imagine the existence of metaphysical or divine powers. In essence, they think that freedom exists, and needs to be maintained and expressed".

As humanist Gus Dur respects the status and value of human beings, so that he does not tolerate any violence, especially human death in the name of ideology or revolution. The basic concept of humanism is understood as a discourse that is used to give a broad appreciation of all things good in human beings plus attention to the welfare of each individual. The concept of humanism presents a great deal of awareness of the major elements of humanity, such as justice, human rights, gender equality, pluralism, and democracy. The concept of humanism bully including humanism religious humanism by still calling obedience to God.

The emergence of humanism of Gus Dur due to the various changes in socio-political conditions of Indonesia. One of them is the new order government and the subsequent government has not been able to solve basic problems for the people, such as poverty, underdevelopment, education, human rights violations, economic inequality, corruption, and other social-humanitarian crises.

From the various approaches existed, the concept of Gus Dur's humanism is a religious humanism. God is the highest principle in the

ideology of his humanism, but still reward human dignity, not only from the aspect of rationality, but also using religious (religious) considerations. The relevance of humanism in the context of Indonesian is his effort to strive consistently on universal human values, democracy, minority rights, justice, gender equality, interfaith dialogue and peacemaking. The relevance of humanism in the context of democracy is reflected in his efforts to encourage States to lay down the principles of justice, human rights protection, freedom of expression, equality of rights and deliberation. Gus Dur's action that some people perceive are controversial based on his humanist thoughts. There are six values of humanism 'divinity', 'humanity', 'justice', 'equality', liberty', and 'local wisdom'.

2.6. Weberian Charismatic Leadership Theory.

The last theory reviewed in this study is the charismatic leadership theory developed by German sociologist Max Weber (1864-1920). Leader is a person who has the skills and strengths in particular excess skills in the field, so as he or she will be able to influence others to achieve some goals. A leader may be defined by who he or she is (the personal) and by the responsibilities, obligations, and tasks he or she is charged with (the position). Leaders' authority can be great or limited and their legitimacy can rest on moral, rational, or practical foundations (Epley, J. L., 2015). Charisma is a word derived from the Greek meaning "gift of god". As well as the ability to predict future events. A sociologist Max Weber (1947) uses this term to describe a form of influence perceptions of subordinates who explained that the leader is endowed by a better ability. Charisma is

the appeal of someone who can not be bought with money. It is energy that does not appear to be but the effect is real. Leadership scholars often have discussed the importance of impression management. It is suggested that charismatic leaders engage in impression management techniques in order to bolster their image of competence, increasing subordinate compliance and faith in them (Takala, T. 2005).

Weber asserts that there are three types of authority that political leaders use to gain support and legitimacy among prospective followers: charismatic, traditional, and rational-legal (bureaucratic) authorities. Charismatic authority is based on “the quality of an individual personality” that makes him/her to be considered to have “supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities” (Weber, 1978 [1922], p. 241). Traditional authority is based on “the established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them” (Weber, 1978 [1922], p. 215), while rational-legal authority is based on “the belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority)” (Weber, 1978 [1922], p. 215).

This study focuses on the leadership and charisma of Gus Dur. What makes charismatic authority unique compared to the other two types of authorities is the fact that it is based not on the power of the office that the individual leader holds or on the status that she or he has, but instead comes from the ability of the leader to “arouse and maintain belief in himself or herself as the source of legitimacy” (Willner, 1984, p. 4). Likely,

in this case, Abdurahman Gus Dur, the leadership of Gus Dur could not be examined only when it becomes a job or leader of a position. Yet it must be seen the history of the formation of Gus Dur's personal from the beginning. In addition to the long process, then the leadership context of that time requires a different leader figure. According to Weber, charismatic leadership comes solely from the personal attributes of the leader, not from the virtue of holding a political office or from formal legal rules. Instead, Weber asserts that the only basis of legitimacy for a charismatic leader is "personal charisma so long as it is proved, that is, as long as it receives recognition from their followers and as long as [they] proved their usefulness charismatically" (Weber, 1978 [1922], p. 244). Due to this charisma, charismatic leaders have the capacity to generate personal loyalty toward themselves among their followers, which sets apart from any other potential leaders within their organizations (Willner and Willner, 1965, p. 77). The authority of charismatic leaders is accepted by their followers based on their ability to "believe in the statements made and ideas advanced by their leader simply because it is [the leader] who has made the statement or advanced the idea" (Willner, 1984, p. 6). This is because the leader is perceived by his/her followers to have special or extraordinary powers that most other persons do not have. The followers' faith on their leaders' special powers is the primary source of the leader's charismatic authority. Due to this perception, the charismatic leader has the capacity to build and sustain unconditional loyalty and support from

his/her followers on the basis of his/her personality, apart from any offices or status s/he might have held (Willner and Willner, 1965, p. 79).

An Indonesian leader who may be considered to be charismatic is Gus Dur, who was president from 1999-2001. He is also a moslem scholar of Nahdhatul Ulama (NU). Gus Dur is a unique figure who often leads where his people do not want to go. He bubbles over with unconventional ideas, many of which have to do with concern for the substance rather than the form of religion and with tolerance toward non-Muslims. Many of his constituents respond with incomprehension if not hostility” (1996, p. 165). Nonetheless, Gus Dur is “an important force for cultural change, bringing new ideas to village Muslims and legitimating those ideas through the traditional authority he holds by virtue of his ancestry and his effectiveness as a political leader” (p. 166) and we might add, his charisma.

Charismatic leadership plays a significant role to motivate the action of religious groups. In the literature on Islamic social movements, scholars have argued that charismatic leadership plays an important role to legitimate the political actions of Islamic groups. Muhammadiyah and Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) which having an estimated 25-30 million members, both organizations have direct and indirect political influence. Both groups have been involved in politics through support for candidates, lobbying, protests, and debates concerning public goods and services, and forming or backing political parties.

Gus Dur comes from Javanese *ulama*. He was educated in Egypt and Iraq in the 1960s and 1970s. Gus Dur supposedly grew restless of studying religious law at the conservative Al- Azhar University in Cairo and so turned his attention to Western sociology, democratic theory, German classical music, and French cinema. He returned to Indonesia in the 1970s to briefly teach and preach. Gus Dur was eventually elected chairman of NU in 1984, where he modernized the organization over the next six years.

This study used Weber theory to support the social knowledge of critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk, 1998). Gus Dur's experiences may be seen through the lens of Weber's theory of charismatic leadership. Some of Weber's ideas apply, while others do not fit as neatly. We might say that Gus Dur had some exceptional qualities, but whether or not followers actually believed Gus Dur had supernatural or superhuman qualities is something that requires research such as surveys and interviews in the future.

2.7 Object

Abdurrahman Ad-Dakhil was Gus Dur's first name. His popular nickname Gus Dur, is derived from Gus, a common honorific for a son of Kyai, from short-form of *bagus* and Dur, short-form of his name, Abdurrahman. Abdurrahman ad-Dakhil Wahid was born on the fourth day of the eighth month of the Islamic calendar in 1940 in Jombang, East Java to Abdul Wahid Hasyim and Siti Solichah. Gus Dur is an Indonesian Muslim religious and political leader who served as the President of

Indonesia from 1999 to 2001. The long-time president of the “Nahdlatul Ulama” and the founder of the National Awakening Party (PKB), Gus Dur was the first elected president of Indonesia after the resignation of Suharto in 1998. In his interview named “Indonesia - Interview with Gus Dur” which takes duration within 5 min 35 sec, the interview told about Indonesian parliament that Gus Dur was accused in two corruption scandals.

2.8 Previous Studies

Studies on CDA have been done by several researchers (e.g. Mustofa, 2008; Azis, 2013, and Mubarok, 2011). Mustofa (2008) analyzed gender stereotyping in the movie “It’s a Boy Girl Things” using Van Dijk’s theory. He analyzed from aspects of microstructure, superstructure, and macrostructure from the process of its formation. Those discourses of gender stereotyping found are classified into ninth kinds of discourse formation. Nine of them present an unequal stereotyping on women. While, after generating the discourse formations, the research analyses its strategies to normalize and eliminate the common discourses of gender role. There processes are verified to analyze critically its negative effects to the women in social life.

Azis (2013) researched on word and sentence structure on Barack Obama’s speech in Osawatomie using Van Dijk’s theory. The findings of his study portrayed that Barack Obama used particular word and sentence structure to create the coherence and cohesion of the discourse as a mean to enhance the power of the discourse. Not to mention, he occasionally used the word and sentence structure to downgrade the out-

group domination and keep his face as a mean for the politic of important. The analysis of the word structure covers the analysis of pronoun, intensifier, sensory words, and discourse marker. And sentential structure includes the passive sentence, rhetorical question, repetition, and coherence.

Mubarok (2013) also researched on phrasal and sentential structure in Julia Eileen Gillard's speech using critical discourse analysis. Julia Eileen Gillard is a former Australian politician who was the 27th Prime Minister of Australia from 2010 to 2013, as leader of the Australian Labor Party. In her findings revealed that Julia Gillard used microstructure level strategies on phrasal and sentential structures of discourse to enhance the cohesion and coherence of her political speeches. In phrasal structure, she often uses the noun phrase combined with articles, possessive pronouns, and adjectives. She, furthermore, frequently stimulates her audiences to think of certain time through temporal sentences. In the strategies of phrasal structures, it consists of a noun phrase, adjective phrase, and verb phrases, meanwhile in the strategies of sentential structures; she chooses temporal sentence, passive voice, rhetorical question, and repetition.

Khusnita, A. S. (2013), entitled *The Implicature Of Humor Utterances In Humor Lucu Ala Gus Dur* and Muhtalim, N. (2016) entitled "*Konsep Negara Islam Substantif Dalam Sosiologi Politik Indonesia Kontemporer (Studi Pemikiran Negara Nir Kekerasan Abdurrahman Gus Dur)*", they observed based on the language used by Gus Dur. Yet they

use the different way (theory), the former investigates the implicature while the second investigates the Critical Discourse Analysis by using Michel Foucault theory.

Similar researchers have investigated Gus Dur's thought as well. Hatta, Nur (2008), entitled "*Orientasi Kiri Islam Pemikiran Politik Abdurrahman Gus Dur*". This study examines Gus Dur's political thoughts toward an Islamic orientation by using critical discourse analysis. He found that Gus Dur's political thought toward an Islamic orientation are a social equity aspect without getting out of humanity's line. In sum, he concludes that Gus Dur is an Indonesian scholar who is appreciative of democracy, using the basis of western scholarship and classical Islamic treasury as in the idea of Islam. This study lacks of data, since it used library research only and did not use any theories to support the discourse of Gus Dur. This study did not show any sociological theory that underlies Gus Dur's political thoughts toward Islamic Orientation.

Ishamudin, M (2010), entitled "*K. H. Abdurrahman Gus Dur Sebagai Political Man (Studi Ketokohan Gus Dur Tahun 1999-2000)*". This study also examines Gus Dur's thought so as he becomes a 'Political Man' and how his roles toward political field in Indonesia. He found more about pluralism thought by Gus Dur. This study lacks of data, since it used library research only and did not use any theories to support the discourse of Gus Dur. This study did not show any sociological theory that underlies Gus Dur's political thoughts toward Islamic Orientation, the present study

adopted humanism and leadership and charisma theories to complete the data.

The previous studies mentioned previously were chosen to strengthen this research. This research will also use Van Dijk theory (critical discourse analysis) which is commonly the latest theory of critical discourse analysis. Those previous studies mentioned previously also shows the gap of this study. The difference between those previous researchers previously and this research are the theory uses microstructures. The object is in Gus Dur's interview. This study describes the local meaning through words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and connections between sentences (Van Dijk, 1980). This study describes the local meanings in Gus Dur's utterances. Microstructures are the actually and directly 'expressed' structures of discourse. By using microstructures, what actions are really expressed by Gus Dur through his utterances can be identified. In principle, discourse should normally exhibit sentential and textual structures to be acceptable in a language community. (Van Dijk, 1980).

This study presents the data about semantic aspect of microstructures to know what the purpose of Gus Dur's action. (See, 2.3.1.3, b). Furthermore, speech acts theory proposed by Searle (1979) were also used to support the 'Action' of the discourse (Gus Dur's utterances). (See, 2.4). The data involves the context of the text, which involves 'Cognition' and 'Society' dimension. 'Cognition' and 'Society' were used to answer the sociological contributing to the pattern of Gus Dur's actions. It involves the factors of social representations concerns on Gus Dur's regime. Hence,

those two dimensions make the study to be critical analysis of discourse. The uniqueness of this study is the fact that this research use a microstructures theory proposed by Van Dijk (1980), which covers the local meanings (Semantics aspect) of Gus Dur's utterances and supported by speech act theory proposed by Searle (1979).